

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/748,147 | 12/31/2003 | Alfred Rieder | | 6859 |
| 759 | 90 05/14/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| Felix J. D'Ambrosio | | | PATEL, HARSHAD R | |
| BACON & THO | OMAS, PLLC | | — ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| Fourth Floor 625 Slaters Lane | | | 2855 | THERNOMER |
| Alexandria, VA | | | DATE MAILED: 05/14/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | 10/748,147 | RIEDER ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Harshad Patel | 2855 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply info. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was reply reply to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty. (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | s-will-be-considered-timely.———————————————————————————————————— | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | | | | | | |
| 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. | | | | | |
| ,— | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | r election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | . - | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| 11) Ine oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | aminer. Note the attached Office | Action of form PTO-152. | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)□ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: | | | | | | |
| Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 10/127,597. | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | | ad | | | | |
| See the attached detailed Office action for a list | or the certified copies not receive | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. | | | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | - | ate atent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/748,147 Page 2

Art Unit: 2855

Claim Objections

1. Claims 3 and 4 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 3, at line 2, "inlet-sid" should be --inlet-side--.

In claim 4, line 6, after "outlet-side tube", a term --section-- should be inserted.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 3. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 4. Claims 5 and 6 recites the limitation "the antivibrator" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Double Patenting

5. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

- 6. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,691,583. This is a double patenting rejection.
- 7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or

Art Unit: 2855

improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claims 4-8 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 21-25 of U.S. Patent No. 6,691,583. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 4 of the instant application excludes the limitation related to the antivibrator fixed to an inlet end and an outlet end of the flow tube. Claims 5 and 6 refer to the antivibrator to oscillate out of phase and in opposite phase, respectively, of the flow tube. The antivibrator lacks antecedent basis, as it is not defined in the independent claim. With the limitation of the antivibrator in the independent claim or in the form of dependent claims, the claims would fall under the statutory type double patenting.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harshad Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2187. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:00 AM-5:30 PM).

Harshad Patel

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2855